























7.6 Comparison of Alternative Transmission Systems

Refer to Appendix I for details on estimated costs. In this comparison, certain components in common are not included in the total costs shown: water treatment plants, secondary and tertiary distribution, and certain local wells and their pump stations.

Table 7-6-1: Summary of Facilities Required

Component	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
Pipelines, Km	Existing	New	Existing	New	Existing	New
D ≤ 200mm	85.3	204	69.1	205	74.2	232
200 < D ≤ 400mm	41.1	203	59.3	212	54.2	159
400 < D ≤ 600mm	149.5	86.9	139.9	89.5	110.2	85.1
D > 600mm	23	99.5	23	99.5	23	124
Total	298.9	594	291.3	605	261.6	600
Pump Stations,				•		•
No.						
Existing PS	11		11		11	
New PS	15		16		17	
Total	26		27		28	
Reservoirs						
New Volume, m3	219,900		220,900		201,200	
Number						
V ≤ 1000m3	57		60		67	
1000 < V ≤ 5000m3	57		58		51	
V > 5000m3	11		10		9	
Total	125		128		127	

Table 7-6-2: Summary of Estimated Costs

Component	Alternative 1, \$	Alternative 2, \$	Alternative 3, \$	
Pump Stations	16,569,472	16,474,797	17,320,650	
Reservoirs	48,763,727	49,482,268	46,088,016	
Pipe lines	122,103,599	121,910,160	131,272,799	
Total Capital Cost, \$	187,436,798	187,867,225	194,681,465	
Annual Power Costs	18,646,771	18,805,399	20,382,829	

7.7 Conclusion

By comparing **Tables 7-6-1 and 7-6-2** above, Alternative 1 is considered to be the preferred option due to the following factors:

- 1. Lowest annual power cost
- 2. Lowest capital costs
- 3. Fewest pump stations (fewest operators)
- 4. High total reservoir storage (good reliability)
- 5. Best use of existing pipelines and least total length of required new pipelines.

